Suppressing and restoring the Dicke superradiance transition by dephasing and decay

Peter Kirton and Jonathan Keeling
SUPA, School of Physics and Astronomy, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, KY16 9SS, United Kingdom
(Dated: November 11, 2016)

We show that dephasing of individual atoms destroys the superradiance transition of the Dicke model, but that adding individual decay toward the spin down state can restore this transition. To demonstrate this, we present a method to give an exact solution for the N atom problem with individual dephasing which scales polynomially with N. By comparing finite size scaling of our exact solution to a cumulant expansion, we confirm the destruction and restoration of the superradiance transition holds in the thermodynamic limit.

arXiv:1611.03342v1 [cond-mat.quant-gas] 10 Nov 2016

The Dicke model is a paradigmatic description of collective coupling between matter and light [1, 2], the most dramatic consequence of which is the phase transition to a superradiant state [3–5]. When an ensemble of N two-level atoms couple sufficiently strongly to a single photon mode, the ground state acquires a macroscopic, coherent, occupation of the photon mode. While the question of whether this phase transition actually occurs in the true ground state of an isolated system is subtle [6–12], the phase transition has been experimentally realized in a driven, open system with ultra-cold atoms in optical cavities [13–17]. Such experiments with open systems naturally prompt questions of how loss mechanisms change the nature of the transition [18–25].

Much work on the open Dicke model has focused on photon loss processes [18–21, 23]: this case is simple to analyze, as it conserves the total spin projection so that the dynamics is confined to a small subspace of the Hilbert space, which can be parameterized in terms of the total spin vector [26, 27]. Recently, the intriguing question of the effect of individual dephasing and dissipation has been studied by Dalla Torre *et al.* [25]. Using a path integral approach based on Majorana fermionic representations of spins they found that the instability of the normal state survives the addition of dephasing. Such a result is intriguing, as previous studies [28, 29] based on the Maxwell-Bloch equations showed that coherence in a system with individual dephasing cannot occur unless there is electronic inversion, as occurs in a regular lasing [30]. This Letter aims to resolve this apparent contradiction, providing important understanding of the relation between superradiance and "regular" lasing.

As with all phase transitions, a sharp transition only arises in the thermodynamic limit: for the Dicke model this corresponds to taking the number of spins $N \to \infty$, while rescaling the matter-light coupling g such that $g^2 N$ remains finite. Identifying whether a phase transition occurs by means of exact numerics then requires finite size scaling, to extrapolate whether a discontinuity arises in the thermodynamic limit. To use exact solutions for this purpose, it is thus necessary to solve the system for relatively large values of N. In the absence of individual dephasing, exact solution of the problem is straightforward, as the size of Hilbert space required grows only polynomially with system size. In the presence of dephasing, this is not true: the size of the Hilbert space grows exponentially with the number of spins. Thus, previous exact studies have been limited to very small [31] numbers of spins. It is therefore hard to directly connect these results to the large N mean-field limit [22, 25, 32].

In this Letter we resolve the above issues by describing a technique, based on the *permutation symmetry* of the density operator, which allows us to find exact numerical solutions to problems in this class in a time that scales only polynominally with N. Such a solution allows us to make direct comparison to the $1/N$ expansion arising from a cumulant expansion, connecting finite size scaling to its asymptotic limit. We find that adding an infinitesimal amount of dephasing to the Dicke model destroys the superradiant phase transition, but by also including spin relaxation the transition is restored. This provides an important example where the exact nature of the dissipation included in a non-equilibrium problem can dramatically change the steady state behavior.

Before discussing the full open system problem, let us first review the ground state phase transition [3–5]. The Dicke Hamiltonian describes the interaction of single photon mode (creation operator $a^\dagger$) with an ensemble of N spins (described by Pauli operators $\sigma_i^{x,y,z}$)

$$H = \omega_c a^\dagger a + \sum_i^N \omega_0 \sigma_i^z + g\sigma_i^x (a + a^\dagger). \tag{1}$$

As the coupling strength g is increased the ground state undergoes a phase transition from a normal state with $\langle a \rangle = 0$ to a superradiant state with $\langle a \rangle \neq 0$ at a critical value of the light-matter interaction strength $g_c^2 N = \omega_0 \omega_c / 2$. The superradiant state breaks the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry of the Hamiltonian where the replacement $\sigma_i^x \to -\sigma_i^x$, $a \to -a$ leaves the system unchanged. Adding photon losses to the problem at rate κ results in a steady-state transition of the Liouvillian which is very closely related to the equilibrium transition with a slightly shifted critical coupling [18], $g_c^2 N = \omega_0 \left(\omega_c^2 + \kappa^2/4\right)/2\omega_c$. This kind of loss does not affect spin conservation, so the dynamics remains within a given projection of the total spin. However, here we also include individual spin decoherence processes, described by a master equation of the

form

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = -i[H,\rho] + \kappa\mathcal{D}[a] + \sum_i^N \Gamma_\phi \mathcal{D}[\sigma_i^z] + \Gamma_\downarrow \mathcal{D}[\sigma_i^-] \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{D}[x] = x\rho x^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{x^\dagger x, \rho\}$ is the Lindblad superoperator. This describes individual spin dephasing at rate Γ_ϕ and losses at rate $\Gamma_\downarrow$ as well as the coherent dynamics of the Hamiltonian and photon losses at rate κ.

To identify why the behavior with dephasing alone is not trivial, we consider first the mean-field Maxwell-Bloch equations, which may be expected to hold at large N [30]. These give equations of motion for the expectation values of the complex photon amplitude and the 3 real components of the spin at each site. The equations for these are given by

$$\partial_t \langle a\rangle = -\left(i\omega_c + \frac{\kappa}{2}\right)\langle a\rangle - igN\langle\sigma^x\rangle \quad (3)$$

$$\partial_t \langle\sigma^x\rangle = -2\omega_0\langle\sigma^y\rangle - \tilde{\Gamma}\langle\sigma^x\rangle \quad (4)$$

$$\partial_t \langle\sigma^y\rangle = 2\omega_0\langle\sigma^x\rangle - 4g\,\mathrm{Re}[\langle a\sigma^z\rangle] - \tilde{\Gamma}\langle\sigma^y\rangle \quad (5)$$

$$\partial_t \langle\sigma^z\rangle = 4g\,\mathrm{Re}[\langle a\sigma^y\rangle] - \Gamma_\downarrow(\langle\sigma^z\rangle + 1) \quad (6)$$

where $\tilde{\Gamma} = 2\Gamma_\phi + \Gamma_\downarrow/2$. The mean field equations can then be calculated from these by assuming that the second cumulants vanish and so e.g. $\langle a\sigma^z\rangle = \langle a\rangle\langle\sigma^z\rangle$. Note that these equations do not assume the collective spin representation can be applied.

One may see that for most choices of losses the stationary state of the mean field equations support both a "normal" solution with $\langle a\rangle = 0$ at small $g\sqrt{N}$, and a superradiant solution with $\langle a\rangle \neq 0$ at large $g\sqrt{N}$. i.e. there is a transition to a state with coherent light in the cavity as one increases $g\sqrt{N}$. The exception to this is when $\Gamma_\downarrow = 0$, $\Gamma_\phi \neq 0$ and $\omega_c \neq 0$ when the only solution possible is the normal state: one can see from Eq. (6) that when $\Gamma_\downarrow = 0$, a solution with $\mathrm{Re}\langle a\rangle \neq 0$ requires $\langle\sigma^y\rangle = 0$, however for $\Gamma_\phi \neq 0$, Eq. (4) then implies $\langle\sigma^x\rangle = 0$ which in turn gives $\langle a\rangle = 0$. A purely imaginary $\langle a\rangle$ can only satisfy Eq. (3) in the special case $\omega_c = 0$, thus apart from this special point, there is no superradiant solution with pure dephasing.

When a phase transition occurs, it can also be found by considering the linear stability of the normal state. This is equivalent to the study of susceptibility by [25]. The normal state always has $\langle a\rangle_{ns} = \langle\sigma^x\rangle_{ns} = \langle\sigma^y\rangle_{ns} = 0$. In the case that $\Gamma_\downarrow \neq 0$, we may also specify $\langle\sigma^z\rangle_{ns} = -1$; for $\Gamma_\downarrow = 0$, any value of $\langle\sigma^z\rangle_{ns}$ is possible. Performing linear stability analysis for $\langle\sigma^x\rangle = \langle\sigma^x\rangle_{ns} + \delta x$ etc. gives the linearized equations

$$\frac{d}{dt}\begin{pmatrix}\delta x\\ \delta y\\ \delta z\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}-\tilde{\Gamma} & -2\omega_0 & 0\\ 2(\omega_0 + J\langle\sigma^z\rangle_{ns}) & -\tilde{\Gamma} & 0\\ 0 & 0 & -\Gamma_\downarrow\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\delta x\\ \delta y\\ \delta z\end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

where $J = 2g^2N\omega_c/(\omega^2 + \kappa^2/4)$ comes from adiabatically eliminating $\langle a\rangle$. This matrix has unstable eigenvalues if

$$g^2N > g_c^2N = \frac{-1/\langle\sigma^z\rangle_{ns}}{2\omega_0\omega_c}\left(\omega_0^2 + \frac{\tilde{\Gamma}^2}{4}\right)\left(\omega_c^2 + \frac{\kappa^2}{4}\right) \quad (8)$$

i.e. the addition of dissipation and dephasing simply shift the critical coupling, in apparent contradiction to the steady state solution when only dephasing is present. However, one may see that Eq. (7) is always singular when $\Gamma_\downarrow = 0$ (i.e. not only at a phase boundary) since any value of $\langle\sigma^z\rangle_{ns}$ is a solution to the mean field equations. Since the critical $g\sqrt{N}$ increases with decreasing $|\langle\sigma^z\rangle_{ns}|$, one may note that even if one normal state solution is unstable, a stable normal state solution with smaller $|\langle\sigma^z\rangle_{ns}|$ will always exist. Thus, a possible resolution within the mean field theory is that for $\Gamma_\downarrow = 0$, $\langle\sigma^z\rangle_{ns}$ becomes restricted to a narrow window approaching 0 as $g\sqrt{N}$ increases. However, we can expect that beyond mean field theory, a unique steady state always exists [33–35], so this behavior is subtle, and requires further analysis as discussed below.

To go beyond mean-field theory, we first introduce a technique which allows exact solution of this model for much larger system sizes than is possible from naive exact diagonliazation. The master equation for our model can be written as a sum of processes where each only affects a single site i and the central photon mode. From this form it is clear that the problem has *permutation symmetry*: swapping any pair of external sites must leave the state unchanged. We may therefore gain a combinatoric reduction in the size of the Liouvillian.

The underlying density matrix must respect the permutation symmetry described above. Therefore, the particular element of the density matrix (ignoring the photon degree of freedom) must obey:

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle s_1^L \dots s_i^L \dots s_j^L \dots s_N^L|\,\rho\,|s_1^R \dots s_i^R \dots s_j^R \dots s_N^R\rangle\\ &\quad\equiv \langle s_1^L \dots s_j^L \dots s_i^L \dots s_N^L|\,\rho\,|s_1^R \dots s_j^R \dots s_i^R \dots s_N^R\rangle\,,\end{aligned}$$

where $s^{L(R)} \in \{0,1\}$ labels the two possible spin states. The full density matrix of the system then separates into sets of permutation symmetric elements. To find the full time evolution of the system we then only need to propagate a single representative element from each of these sets. If one requires this permutation symmetry applies directly to wavefunctions, this would lead to the conservation of spin projection discussed earlier. However, dephasing and loss mean that this restriction is not valid for the wavefunction, but does survive for the elements of the density matrix. Thus, we can fully account for the effects of individual dephasing and decay, while keeping the size of the numerical problem manageable.

To construct the Liouvillian, $\mathcal{L}$, first we need to generate a list which contains one element from each permutation symmetric set. To do this we combine the left and

right indices for each spin so that the state at each site is described by a single number $\langle s_i^L|\,\rho\,|s_i^R\rangle \to \varsigma_i = s_i^L + 2s_i^R$. We choose that the representative element for each set is the one where this list of numbers is monotonically increasing, $\varsigma_1 \leq \varsigma_2 \ldots \leq \varsigma_N$. The full list of states which we need to consider is then the tensor product of this list with the photon states.

We can then find how $\mathcal{L}$ acts on each representative element, and project the resulting density matrix back onto the set of representative elements, by putting the spin indices $\{\varsigma_i\}$ into the required monotonically increasing order. We emphasize again that no approximations have been made in reducing the size of the Liouvillian, if the problem respects the symmetries described above then all of the density matrix elements in each class are equivalent and so we only need to keep one. Standard ODE solving routines can then be used to find time evolution of the density matrix from a given initial state while to find steady state properties Arnoldi iteration can be used to find the eigenvector of $\mathcal{L}$ with eigenvalue 0.

To calculate most quantities of interest from the full (but compressed) density matrix described above we need to find an efficient way to trace out many of the degrees of freedom associated with the spins. For example to find the reduced density matrix of a single spin and the photon we first identify elements which differ by at most a single value in the left and right spin states i.e. those which are diagonal in all the spins we wish to trace out. Then we calculate the number of ways each individual element contributes to the sum, which is given by the multinominal coefficient, $C = (N-1)!/n_\uparrow! n_\downarrow!$, where $n_{\uparrow(\downarrow)}$ is the number of spin up (down) particles in the state for the $N-1$ spins which are being traced out (therefore $n_\uparrow + n_\downarrow = N-1$). For practical reasons this calculation is performed once at the start of a run and a $N_{\rm full} \times N_{\rm reduced}$ matrix stored which maps a full density matrix of the system (with $N_{\rm full}$ elements) to a reduced matrix (with $N_{\rm reduced}$ elements). From these reduced density matrices it is then straightforward to calculate, for example, expectation values of operators and Wigner distributions.

This technique is applicable to wide variety of models for example the Tavis-Cummings model or simple models from laser theory, including arbitrary, permutation symmetry preserving dissipation terms. Similar techniques were employed in Ref. [36] to study equilibrium properties of a model where the local Hilbert space is larger than spin-1/2.

Using our exact solution we show the steady state Wigner function of the photon for various combinations of loss processes in Fig. 1. When both $\Gamma_\phi = \Gamma_\downarrow = 0$ we see two well separated peaks which correspond to the two symmetry broken states in the thermodynamic limit: as expected for a finite size system, the steady state density matrix is a mixture of the symmetry broken states — true symmetry breaking only arises in the thermodynamic limit, when the tunneling time between these solutions diverges, associated with a vanishing gap in the spectrum of the Liouvillian [37, 38]. Adding spin losses to this picture as in Fig. 1(b) slightly reduces the amplitude of the separation and the shape of these states but does not destroy the fact that two states are present. Adding any dephasing causes the two states to coalesce destroying the possibility for a phase transition. The timescale for reaching this state diverges as the dephasing rate is reduced, but here we are interested in the asymptotic long time behavior. Interestingly, in the presence of both losses and dephasing the indication from these results is that the transition survives. The Wigner function has two peaks, but these are not as well separated as in the other cases. In what follows we will verify this behavior survives in the thermodynamic limit.



FIG. 1. Wigner functions for the photon at $g\sqrt{N} = 0.9$, $\omega = 1$, $\omega_0 = 0.5$, $\kappa = 1$ and $N = 30$ for the four combinations of loss processes shown. The loss rates are $\Gamma_\downarrow = 0.2$ (b) and (d), $\Gamma_\phi = 0.1$ (d) and $\Gamma_\phi = 0.01$ (c).

The technique we have described above is useful for calculating all of the properties of the system at relatively small values of N. To examine the nature of the phase transition at larger N we will make a cumulant expansion which allows us to develop a perturbation series in powers of $1/N$ and so connect to the small N results of the exact solution.

To find the corrections of order $1/N$ we calculate the equations for the second moments truncating by assuming that the third cumulants vanish. Writing such cumulant equations also allows a simple connection to approaches widely used in laser theory [30, 39], and so provides further conceptual clarifications. The standard mean-field theory for the superradiance transition is written in terms of expectations of fields that break the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry of the Dicke model. As such, mean-field theory is formally incorrect for any finite size system, where quantum fluctuations and tunneling between the solutions restores the symmetry. In contrast, a frequently

used approach for lasers involves writing equations for the photon number, which does not break any symmetries of the Hamiltonian. The phase transition is then signaled not by symmetry breaking, but by a discontinuity arising in the thermodynamic limit [30, 39]. The cumulant expansion moreover allows one to explicitly see how this discontinuity arises only as $N \to \infty$, and thus allows direct comparison to exact solutions.

With this aim in mind we write equations only for those first- and second-order cumulants which respect the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry of the Dicke model. To close the equations, we split the third order moments into products of first and second order moments.

When considering equations for second moments, we may start from the moments of the photon distribution that we wish to consider:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t \langle a^\dagger a\rangle &= -\kappa \langle a^\dagger a\rangle - 2gN \,\mathrm{Im}[C^{ax}]\\ \partial_t \langle aa\rangle &= -(2i\omega+\kappa)\langle aa\rangle - 2igNC^{ax}.\end{aligned}$$

where we have denoted $C^{ax} = \langle a\sigma^x\rangle$ for brevity. These equations involve correlations between photon and spin states, which obey:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t C^{ax} &= -\left(i\omega + \frac{\kappa}{2} + \tilde{\Gamma}\right) C^{ax} - 2\omega_0 C^{ay}\\ &\quad -ig\left[(N-1)\,C^{xx}+1\right],\\ \partial_t C^{ay} &= -\left(i\omega + \frac{\kappa}{2} + \tilde{\Gamma}\right) C^{ay} - 2g\langle\sigma^z\rangle\left(\langle aa\rangle + \langle a^\dagger a\rangle\right)\\ &\quad +2\omega_0 C^{ax} - ig[(N-1)C^{xy} - i\langle\sigma^z\rangle].\end{aligned}$$

In these equations $C^{\alpha\beta}$ means $\langle\sigma_i^\alpha \sigma_{j\neq i}^\beta\rangle$ the correlation between σ^α at one site and σ^β at another. All such correlations are equivalent due to permutation symmetry, while for products of operators on the same site, we have used the standard products of Pauli matrices. These cross correlations obey:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t C^{xx} &= -4\omega_0 C^{xy} - 2\tilde{\Gamma}C^{xx},\\ \partial_t C^{yy} &= 4\omega_0 C^{xy} - 2\tilde{\Gamma}C^{yy} - 8g\langle\sigma^z\rangle\,\mathrm{Re}[C^{ay}],\\ \partial_t C^{zz} &= 8g\langle\sigma^z\rangle\,\mathrm{Re}[C^{ay}] - 2\Gamma_\downarrow(C^{zz}+\langle\sigma^z\rangle),\\ \partial_t C^{xy} &= 2\omega_0(C^{xx}-C^{yy}) - \tilde{\Gamma}C^{xy} - 4g\langle\sigma^z\rangle\,\mathrm{Re}[C^{ax}].\end{aligned}$$

These equations then allow us to cross from the small N limit — accessible by exact numerics — to the large N limit required to make concrete statements about phase transitions.

In Fig. 2(a) we compare the results of the exact solution to those of the second order cumulant expansion, for the steady state photon number as a function of N. At large N both approaches match and so we can be confident that the cumulant expansion gives the correct steady state behavior. For the case $\Gamma_\downarrow = \Gamma_\phi = 0$, the exact solution can make use of the fixed spin projection dynamics, allowing exact results up to larger N. For the largest values of N we use a quantum trajectories approach [40, 41] to find the steady state. For the other cases, the value of N achievable is limited by the size of the photon Hilbert space needed: this size differs depending on the dephasing processes: for the case with $\Gamma_\phi = 0, \Gamma_\downarrow \neq 0$ we require photon number up to 35 restricting us to $N = 30$.



FIG. 2. (a) Steady state photon number vs N. The labels show which loss processes are present. The lines correspond, from top to bottom, to $\Gamma_\downarrow = \Gamma_\phi = 0$ (black), $\Gamma_\downarrow = 0.2$, $\Gamma_\phi = 0$ (blue), $\Gamma_\downarrow = 0.2$, $\Gamma_\phi = 0.1$ (green) and $\Gamma_\downarrow = 0$, $\Gamma_\phi = 0.01$ (red). The solid lines are the second order cumulant expansion and the dots show the numerically exact solution. Other parameters are: $g\sqrt{N} = 0.9$, $\omega = 1$, $\omega_0 = 0.5$, $\kappa = 1$. For the $\Gamma_\downarrow = \Gamma_\phi = 0$ case, the crosses at large N values result from averaging 5000 quantum trajectories, except for $N = 120$ and $N = 150$ where 1000 and 500 trajectories were used respectively. (b) Steady state photon number vs $g\sqrt{N}$ calculated using the second order cumulant expansion. The lines correspond to the same loss processes and parameters as in (a) with $N = 500$.

By considering the finite size scaling of $\langle a^\dagger a\rangle/N$, we see a clear distinction that for dephasing alone, this ratio vanishes as $N \to \infty$, but remains finite for all other cases. This indicates that the superradiant phase is not present for the pure dephasing case. The value of light-matter coupling chosen here is well above the expected value for the transition which, for the no spin decoherence case, would be at $g_c\sqrt{N} \simeq 0.56$. Similar calculation below this threshold value show that the rescaled steady state photon number goes to 0 for all four cases. We also note that convergence of the exact and cumulant expansion results is better in the presence of dephasing.

In Fig. 2(b) we show the rescaled steady state photon number as a function of $g\sqrt{N}$ for the four different scenarios calculated from the cumulant expansion. We can clearly see the emergence of non-analytic behavior in all the results except for the case with only dephasing. The discontinuities occur at exactly the location predicted by Eq. (8). While the addition of loss processes does reduce the steady photon number there is still a superradiant phase except in the pure dephasing model.

In conclusion we have explored the fate of the Dicke phase transition in the presence of losses and dephasing.

We find that while adding an infinitesimal amount of dephasing to the model kills the steady state phase transition, the transition survives the presence of spin losses. Surprisingly we find that spin losses are able to stabilize the transition to dephasing. To study this model we introduced a new numerical technique to exactly describe the density matrix of the system which scales only polynomially with the number of spins. This technique can be used to study many other models which have the same permutation symmetry as those described here.

We acknowledge useful discussions with M. Hartmann and E. Dalla Torre. PGK acknowledges support from EPSRC (EP/M010910/1). JK acknowledge support from EPSRC program TOPNES (EP/I031014/1).

[1] R. H. Dicke, Phys. Rev. **93**, 99 (1954).
[2] B. M. Garraway, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences **369**, 1137 (2011).
[3] K. Hepp and E. H. Lieb, Annals of Physics **76**, 360 (1973).
[4] Y. K. Wang and F. T. Hioe, Phys. Rev. A **7**, 831 (1973).
[5] H. Carmichael, C. Gardiner, and D. Walls, Physics Letters A **46**, 47 (1973).
[6] K. Rzażewski, K. Wódkiewicz, and W. Żakowicz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **35**, 432 (1975).
[7] P. Nataf and C. Ciuti, Nat. Commun. **1**, 72 (2010).
[8] O. Viehmann, J. von Delft, and F. Marquardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 113602 (2011).
[9] A. Vukics and P. Domokos, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 053807 (2012).
[10] M. Bamba and T. Ogawa, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 063825 (2014).
[11] A. Vukics, T. Grießer, and P. Domokos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 073601 (2014).
[12] T. Jaako, Z.-L. Xiang, J. J. Garcia-Ripoll, and P. Rabl, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 033850 (2016).
[13] K. Baumann, C. Guerlin, F. Brennecke, and T. Esslinger, Nature **464**, 1301 (2010).
[14] K. Baumann, R. Mottl, F. Brennecke, and T. Esslinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 140402 (2011).
[15] M. P. Baden, K. J. Arnold, A. L. Grimsmo, S. Parkins, and M. D. Barrett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 020408 (2014).
[16] J. Klinder, H. Keßler, M. R. Bakhtiari, M. Thorwart, and A. Hemmerich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 230403 (2015).
[17] A. J. Kollár, A. T. Papageorge, V. D. Vaidya, Y. Guo, J. Keeling, and B. L. Lev, "Supermode-density-wave-polariton condensation," (2016), arXiv:1606.04127.
[18] F. Dimer, B. Estienne, A. Parkins, and H. Carmichael, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 013804 (2007).
[19] D. Nagy, G. Kónya, G. Szirmai, and P. Domokos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 130401 (2010).
[20] J. Keeling, M. J. Bhaseen, and B. D. Simons, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 043001 (2010).
[21] B. Öztop, M. Bordyuh, Ö. E. Müstecaplıoğlu, and H. E. Türeci, New Journal of Physics **14**, 085011 (2012).
[22] E. G. Dalla Torre, S. Diehl, M. D. Lukin, S. Sachdev, and P. Strack, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 023831 (2013).
[23] F. Piazza, P. Strack, and W. Zwerger, Annals of Physics **339**, 135 (2013).
[24] D. Nagy and P. Domokos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 043601 (2015).
[25] E. G. Dalla Torre, Y. Shchadilova, E. Y. Wilner, M. D. Lukin, and E. Demler, "Dicke phase transition without total spin conservation," (2016), preprint, 1608.06293.
[26] C. Emary and T. Brandes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 044101 (2003).
[27] C. Emary and T. Brandes, Phys. Rev. E **67**, 066203 (2003).
[28] M. H. Szymanska, *Bose Condensation and Lasing in Optical Microstructures*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge (2001), cond-mat/0204294.
[29] M. H. Szymanska, P. B. Littlewood, and B. D. Simons, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 013818 (2003).
[30] H. Haken, in *Quantum Optics*, edited by S. M. Kay and A. Maitland (Academic Press, New York, 1970) p. 201.
[31] S. Genway, W. Li, C. Ates, B. P. Lanyon, and I. Lesanovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 023603 (2014).
[32] J. Gelhausen, M. Buchhold, and P. Strack, "Many-body quantum optics with decaying atomic spin states:(γ, κ) Dicke model," (2016), preprint, 1605.07637.
[33] P. D. Drummond and D. F. Walls, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General **13**, 725 (1980).
[34] L. Lugiato, Prog. Opt. **21**, 69 (1984).
[35] S. R. K. Rodriguez, W. Casteels, F. Storme, I. Sagnes, L. Le, E. Galopin, A. Lema, A. Amo, C. Ciuti, and J. Bloch, "Dynamic optical hysteresis in the quantum regime," (2016), preprint, 1608.00260.
[36] M. A. Zeb, P. G. Kirton, and J. Keeling, "Exact quantum states of the Holstein-Tavis-Cummings model," (2016), preprint, 1608.08929.
[37] E. M. Kessler, G. Giedke, A. Imamoglu, S. F. Yelin, M. D. Lukin, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 012116 (2012).
[38] W. Casteels, R. Fazio, and C. Ciuti, "Critical scaling of the liouvillian gap for a nonlinear driven-dissipative resonator," (2016), preprint, 1608.00717.
[39] H. Haken, Rev. Mod. Phys. **47**, 67 (1975).
[40] H. Carmichael, *An open systems approach to quantum optics*, Vol. 18 (Springer Science & Business Media, 2009).
[41] J. Johansson, P. Nation, and F. Nori, Computer Physics Communications **184**, 1234 (2013).